DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 058 SP 006 036

AUTHOR Dykes, Archie R.
TITLE Training Institute for Staff Members of School Systems with Multi-Cultural Schools.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ. - Memphis State Univ. Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education, Memphis.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 66
CONTRACT OEC-6-37-017
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Culturally Disadvantaged; Human Relations; *Inservice Education; *Integration Methods; *Racial Integration; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This report describes a training institute for staff members of school systems with multicultural schools. Eighty members of the professional staffs of the Memphis City and Shelby County School Systems participated in the institute. The program was designed to relate to multicultural schools, school desegregation, and culturally disadvantaged children. Training sessions included lectures, large and small group discussions, field trips, demonstrations, and the use of audio-visual materials. Formal presentations before the entire group consumed approximately 15 hours weekly, and planned small group activities utilized approximately an equal amount of time. These activities were supplemented frequently with audio-visual materials and limited visitation to area schools engaged in the desegregation process. Participant response to the program was positive. Evidence indicated the participants became more knowledgeable and understanding of problems of the culturally disadvantaged and more willing to take positive action. Appendixes of related program material are included.) (Author/MJM)

ED 073058

OE - OCD
SP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

for Staff Members of

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE / College of Education / U.T. - M.S.U. CENTER
in Cooperation With The United States Office of Education
Jan. 31 - April 16, 1966

SP 006 036

Archie Dykes
Institute Director & Reporter

ED 073058

TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR STAFF MEMBERS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS WITH MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOLS

Archie R. Dykes

Director and Author of Report

Contract Number OE-6-37-017

Public Law 88-352, Title IV, Section 404

Civil Rights Act of 1964

RECEIVED
OE/EEOP
AUG 1966

Conducted by

The University of Tennessee

College of Education

The University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Center
Memphis, Tennessee

The Project Reported Herein Was Supported by a Contract

from the

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

June 20, 1966

ABSTRACT

of

TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR STAFF MEMBERS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS
WITH MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOLS

DATES

PLANNING PHASE - January 3, 1966 through January 29, 1966

TRAINING PHASE - January 31, 1966 through February 11, 1966

FOLLOW-UP PHASE - February 19, 1966 through April 16, 1966

PARTICIPANTS

Eighty members of the professional staffs of the Memphis City and Shelby County School Systems participated in the Institute. Sixty participants were from the Memphis City schools and twenty were from the Shelby County schools(allocated on the basis of the relative sizes of the two systems). Included were teachers, principals, guidance counselors, and supervisors from all grade levels. The participants were equally divided as to race. Selection of participants was accomplished by personnel of the involved school systems.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES

1. To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members of multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally disadvantaged children.

2. To give Institute participants an increased, individual self-awareness of personal values as these relate to minority-group and disadvantaged children to the end that greater objectivity toward and acceptance of such children might result.

3. To create improved understanding of approaches which may be employed in the integrated school for creating appropriate learning situations, including school organization, teacher-student relationships, and specific techniques.

4. To train individuals who, when they resumed work in their respective professional positions, would be thoroughly prepared to act both in their own schools and on a system-wide basis as resource specialists on educational problems stemming from desegregation.

PROGRAM PROCEDURES

The program developed to implement the objectives of the Institute was based on theoretical and empirical considerations relating to multi-cultural schools, school desegregation, and culturally disadvantaged children. The training sessions included lectures, large and small group discussions, field trips, demonstrations, and the use of appropriate audio-visual materials. Formal presentations before the entire group consumed approximately fifteen hours weekly and planned small-group activities utilized approximately an equal amount of time. These activities were supplemented frequently with audio-visual materials and limited visitation to area schools engaged in the desegregation process.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Response to the program on the part of the participants was generally quite positive. It appeared that an excellent balance of large group presentations (information giving) and small group discussions (concept formation and personalizing of same) was achieved. The participants seemed to develop through

their experiences together meaningful perceptions of the entire spectrum of social, education, and human relations problems bound up in school integration and multi-cultural education.

In addition to the increased understanding of problems occasioned by school desegregation, Institute participants appeared to develop a personalized commitment to take positive action to seek solutions to problems toward which they had heretofore been passive. That is, the participants seemed to feel a greater sense of personal responsibility for alleviating school problems deriving from desegregation.

Evidence indicates that Institute participants became more knowledgeable and more understanding of problems of the culturally disadvantaged and more willing to take positive action in applying their new knowledge and understandings.

I. PARTICIPANTS

Abron, Mrs. Bernice W. - Teacher
Lincoln Jr. High School

Barber, Mr. James A. - Principal
Kansas Elementary School

Banks, Mrs. Nanilee H. - Teacher
Douglass School

Bourne, Mr. W. A. - Principal
Memphis Technical High School

Branch, Mrs. Willye Lee - Teacher
Hamilton Elementary School

Briney, Miss Lillian - Teacher
Lawler School

Bruce, Mrs. Betty - Teacher
Whitehaven School

Bruning, Mrs. Jan - Teacher
Vollentine School

Burr, Mrs. Gladys - Supervisor
Memphis City Schools

Campbell, Mr. Floyd M. - Principal
Melrose High School

Carr, Mr. Joseph K. - Teacher
Washington High School

Cash, Mr. Harry T. - Principal
Hamilton School

Chism, Mr. Ernest - Coach, Teacher
Sherwood School

Clayton, Miss Irene - Teacher
Fairview Jr. High School

Collier, Mrs. Mary W. - Teacher
Melrose High School

Conley, Mr. Melvin N. - Principal
Douglass High School

Crossley, Mrs. Mattie R. - Supervisor
Memphis City Schools

Davis, Mrs. Bernice E. - Teacher
Sherwood Elementary School

Dinkins, Miss Mary Lou - Teacher
Bethel Grove School

Doggett, Miss Verneta - Teacher
Chicago Park School

Duke, Mrs. Rudelle - Teacher
Westwood School

Evans, Mrs. Dorothy - Teacher
Hamilton School

Evans, Mrs. Mary - Teacher
Bruce School

Ferrell, Miss Marilyn - Teacher
Bellevue School

Gandy, Miss Eleanor - Teacher
Manassas High School

Godwin, Mrs. Elgie - Teacher
Geeter School

Henry, Mrs. Annie C. - Teacher
Mitchell Road High School

Hewitt, Mrs. Betty R. - Teacher
Gordon School

Hill, Mrs. Betty - Teacher
Elmore Park School

Hobson, Mr. Louis B. - Principal
Manassas High School

Johnson, Mrs. Christine C. - Teacher
Norris Elementary School

Jones, Miss Anna - Principal
Klondike School

Jones, Mr. Donald - Principal
Rozelle Elementary School

Jones, Mr. Willie L. - Teacher
Capleville High School

better, Mr. Robert L. - Teacher
ry Jr. High School

ties, Mrs. Aline F. - Teacher
Pisgah School

x, Mrs. Hildred C. - Teacher
ida School

, Miss Rose Marie - Teacher
er Elementary School

um, Mr. Arthur J., Jr. - Teacher,
h Side School Coach

ell, Miss Ruth E. - Teacher
re Park School

ael, Mr. John - Principal
s School

ow, Mrs. Marty - Teacher
antown School

s, Mrs. Odessa W. - Teacher
er Jr. High School

, Mrs. Teresa - Teacher
School

sh, Mr. Ted - Teacher
ett School

n, Miss Lucille M. - Principal
Park School

erson, Mr. Charles J., Jr. - Principal
er Avenue School

lips, Mr. Frank L., Jr. - Counselor
er School

lips, Mr. Paul J. - Teacher
ington Central School

ley, Mrs. Jessie K. - Teacher
ia Avenue School

y, Miss Pearl - Teacher
stock High School

phatt, Miss Kay - Teacher
ood Jr. High School

Richter, Mr. Adolph O. - Teacher
Hillcrest School

Romby, Mrs. Elizabeth K. - Counselor
Lester High School

Romine, Mrs. Shirley H. - Teacher
Hollywood School

Sanderlin, Mrs. Jeraldine - Teacher
Dunn Avenue School

Sanderson, Mrs. Elizabeth - Teacher
Springdale School

Sargent, Mrs. Lonnie H. - Teacher
Leath School

Schwaiger, Mrs. Elizabeth B. - Teacher
Cordova School

Sharpe, Mr. Joseph D. - Teacher
Pine Hill School

Siler, Mr. Rush W. - Principal
White Station School

Simmons, Mr. D. W. - Principal
Sherwood Jr. High School

Simonton, Mrs. Va. F. - Teacher, Counselor
Hillcrest High School

Smith, Mrs. Mary E. - Teacher
Central High School

Spencer, Mrs. Tinnie S. - Teacher
Barret's Chapel School

Stanton, Mrs. Katherine - Principal
Goodlett School

Starks, Mrs. Alma E. - Teacher
Grant Elementary School

Strong, Mrs. Josephine - Teacher
Riverview School

Stryker, Miss Agnes - Teacher
Maury School

Sweet, Mr. William H. - Principal
T. W. Patterson High School

errell, Mrs. Mary B. - Librarian
. A. Harrold School

hompson, Mrs. Ella B. - Teacher
aldwell School

hompson, Mr. James H. - Teacher
eabody School

hompson, Miss Margaret - Coordinator
entral High School of Guidance

ubbs, Mr. Don T. - Guidance
ongview Jr. High School

Vaught, Mrs. Iola M. - Teacher
Alonzo Locke School

Warren, Mrs. Sarah F. - Teacher
Hyde Park School

Webb, Mrs. Montine - Teacher
Dunbar Elementary School

Weiss, Mr. Harold G. - Counselor
Humes High School

Woods, Mr. James R. - Teacher
Capleville School

II. STAFF

ermanent Staff

The following members of the University of Tennessee faculty, stationed n the University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Center for Advanced raduate Study in Education in Memphis, provided direction for the Institute and also participated in program activities.

Archie R. Dykes (Director), Ed.D. Professor of Education, The University of Tennessee and Director of the UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education. Coordinated overall program and also served as a discussion leader for one of the small discussion groups.

Harry F. Hodge, Jr., Ed.D. Assistant Professor of Education, The University of Tennessee and instructor in the UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education. Assumed responsibility for the evaluation of the Institute and also served as a discussion leader for one of the small discussion groups.

Serving various functions during the course of the Institute were the ollowing staff members of Memphis State University:

Sam H. Johnson, Ed.D. Dean, the School of Education.

Rosestelle Woolner, Assistant Professor, The School of Education.

Walter Nelms, Ed.D. Assistant Professor, The School of Education.

Robert E. Davis, Ed.D. Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology and Guidance, The School of Education.

Consultants and Guest Lecturers

The following guest speakers and lecturers were among these making major presentations during the Institute:

Dr. Ina C. Brown, Professor of Social Anthropology, Scarritt College.

Dr. Jack Robertson, Director, Division of Business and Economics, West Virginia Institute of Technology.

Dr. Juanita Williamson, Professor, LeMoyne College.

Gertrude Noar, Education Director, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Dr. Donald Arnstine, Associate Professor, School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Dr. A. Harry Passow, Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dr. N. A. Crippens, Director, The Nashville Education Improvement Project, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Fred Venditti, Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of Tennessee.

Dr. Aeolian Lockhart, Assistant Principal, Cameron High School, Nashville, Tennessee

Administrative and Planning Consultants

The following persons were helpful in planning the Institute program:

Dr. E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent, Memphis City Schools

Mr. George Barnes, Superintendent, Shelby County Schools

Miss Margaret Williams, Director of Certificated Personnel, Memphis City Schools

Mr. Maurice Roach, Coordinator of Federal Projects, Memphis City Schools

Mr. Arthur Rauscher, Director of Instruction, Shelby County Schools

Mr. Morgan Christian, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Memphis City Schools

Dr. Fred Venditti, Assistant Professor, College of Education University of Tennessee

III. OBJECTIVES

The broad purposes of the Institute were two-fold. Its first broad purpose was to sensitize teachers and other professional staff members of integrating schools to the unique problems of culturally disadvantaged children, for a great majority of the Negro pupils who are being integrated into formerly all-white schools must be so categorized. Its second broad purpose was to focus upon specific educational problems that stem typically from desegregation (e.g., those associated with motivation, achievement, instructional methodology, the development of special instructional materials, curriculum design and organizational patterns) and provide participants with the incentive, knowledge, and skills that are requisite to an effective attack upon such problems. The general purposes of the Institute were to be achieved through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives, stated in terms of expected behavioral and concept changes:

1. Ability to make a realistic self-appraisal of one's own personality dynamics and attitudes as they relate to his teaching effectiveness within the integrating school.
2. Understanding that the potential for progress ascribed to the learner by the teacher is one of the most important factors controlling the total learning process.
3. Understanding the fallacy of the notion that the I.Q. is a kind of ironclad determinant of a child's future.
4. An understanding of the characteristics of the impoverished community and the nature, causes and effects of cultural disadvantagement.
5. Insight into typical behavior patterns and attitudes of disadvantaged children and adults and ability to empathize with them.

6. Understanding or the differences between the value systems of middle- and lower-class subcultures and the implications of both in the classroom.

7. Understanding of normal and gifted students, of achievers and under-achievers (with emphasis given to the salutary effects which improved educational, social, and economic conditions produce among able children from disadvantaged settings).

8. Ability to provide a remedial reading program geared to the language and experience limitations of the children involved.

9. Knowledge of and ability to apply and develop instructional techniques appropriate to the needs of culturally disadvantaged children in the fields of mathematics, science, social studies, and art.

10. Skill in analyzing problems of teaching and learning in schools enrolling disadvantaged children, and skill in preparing original teaching materials and adapting existing materials to the needs of these children.

IV. METHODS

The Institute, a "short-term" type, was divided into two distinct parts: (1) a two-week period of consecutive daily sessions and (2) a series of eight weekly follow-up meetings, consuming a full day's time and conducted on subsequent Saturdays.

The Two-Week Phase

The initial two-week phase of the Institute had three broad purposes, the accomplishment of which required the teachers' absence from their regular jobs for an extended period of time. These three purposes were (1) to give the participants broad basic orientation relative to class, racial, and cultural characteristics and differences, (2) to provide them with many opportunities to engage with professional assistance, individ-

ually and in small groups, in meaningful analysis and evaluation of their personal feelings, attitudes, and ideas regarding race and cultural disadvantagement, and (3) to inform them fully of the effects of racial stigmatization and cultural disadvantagement upon children both in and out of school.

During the two-week phase of the Institute accomplishment of the basic objectives stated above was sought through required individual reading and study on the part of the participants, large group lectures, panel discussions, and by involving the participants in frequent small-group discussions during which they might share ideas, raise questions, and express feelings stimulated by the various large-group activities.

In order to give appropriate background information to the participants, selected books and pamphlets were provided each participant at the opening of the Institute. (The books and materials used are listed in Section VI of this report.) The materials remained in the possession of the participants throughout the Institute and were used frequently for reference purposes.

Lectures offered during the two-week phase of the Institute were delivered by highly competent professionals from the fields of psychology, sociology, economics, and anthropology as well as education. (See program for the two-week phase of the Institute, Appendix A.)

All lectures were followed by discussions in small groups. These discussions culminated in the formation of questions group members wished to address to the lecturers in "wrap-up" question-

and-answer sessions conducted on a large-group basis. The participants were thus given maximum opportunity to react personally to ideas and information presented by the consultants. At the same time, an effective means of eliciting broadly relevant questions from the membership of the large-group and funneling them to the consultants was employed. Assigned leaders with appropriate competency met regularly with the participants in their small groups to facilitate and stimulate proceedings. The contribution of the leaders was significant, especially since most had functioned in the same capacity during a previous institute conducted at the University during the winter and spring of 1965.

Frequently, the lectures were supplemented with movies and panel discussions which injected variety into the program and added new dimensions of understanding to the words of the consultants. (See program, Appendix A.)

The Weekly Follow-Up Sessions

The major purpose of the weekly meetings was to acquaint the participants with specific instructional techniques, approaches, materials, aids, and modes of school organization which are especially appropriate for multi-cultural student groups. A complementary purpose of the meetings was to continue to direct the attention of the participants to the broad and pervasive social and economic problems troubling our society (i.e., especially those having relevance for the multi-cultural school) and to provide them with frequent opportunities to discuss with qualified

experts and with each other instructional and other problems they were confronting on their jobs. Such discussion, usually in a small-group setting, provided opportunity for the exchange of ideas, the solicitation of advice, and the reporting of progress.

Methodology employed during the period of follow-up sessions was substantially the same as that employed during the initial two-week phase of the Institute. (See the program for follow-up sessions, Appendix B.) Individual reading and study, lectures, films, panels, and large- and small-group discussions remained an integral part of the program. Demonstrations, displays of materials, and school visitation were added to it.

V. FACILITIES

Large group lectures and small-group discussions took place in air-conditioned facilities in the School of Education Building on the Memphis State University campus. The School of Education auditorium was used for large group meetings while classrooms and discussion rooms were used for the small group meetings. All facilities of the University were fully available to Institute participants. The school visitations were conducted in the Memphis City School System.

VI. TEACHING AIDS

1. A packet of materials donated by the Headquarters of the American Jewish Committee, New York City, to each participant included:

"Films for Human Relations"
"Books to Grow On"

"Securing Our Children Against Prejudice"
"The Right to Have Scoundrels"
"Somebody's Brother"
"The Gentle People of Prejudice"
"Not Like Other Children"
"Understanding Intergroup Relations"
"Give Slum Children a Chance"
"People Aren't Born Prejudiced"
"Life Is Fun in a Smiling, Fair-Skinned World"
"Children and Discrimination"
"Dixie Teachers Report Their Pupils Learn Well in Mixed-Race Schools"
"How Adults Influence Children"

2. The following materials, purchased with funds provided by the grant, were supplied each Institute participant:

Education in Depressed Areas (edited by A. Harry Passow)
Learning Together (edited by Meyer Weinberg)
Public Affairs Pamphlets No. 85 (The Races of Mankind), No. 95 (The Negro in America), No. 255 (A Guide to School Desegregation), No. 362 (The Poor Among Us--A Challenge and Opportunity), No. 367 (Equal Justice for the Poor Man)

3. A suggested reading list of inexpensive paperback books and materials in the Memphis State University library was provided each participant. In addition, sources of useful instructional materials were identified.

4. Carefully selected films were used frequently during the Institute. The titles of those shown are included in the official program. (See Appendices A and B.)

VII. INFORMAL PROGRAM

Planned social activities included luncheons together and coffees during the Institute. Important informal associations took place among Institute participants on these occasions. Many participants felt these were extremely valuable since they provided opportunity to get to know well members of the opposite race. For some Institute participants, this was the first such opportunity.

VIII. CONSULTATION AND GUIDANCE

Considerable staff consultation with participants took place throughout the course of the Institute. Most was done in small groups where staff members and/or special consultants were almost always present. In the small group setting, opportunities were provided for participants to question staff members directly about immediate concerns generated by the Institute program and to obtain as well their opinion and advice regarding work-a-day school problems. Consultation between staff members and participants also took place both before and after regular Institute hours whenever participants requested it.

IX. EVALUATION

The general purpose of the evaluation was to examine the opinions relative to Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons held by the participating teachers and administrators. In addition to providing a partial assessment of the effectiveness of the present Institute, it was felt that data from such an investigation might be of assistance in planning other similar institutes.

Specifically, the evaluation dealt with the following questions:

1. What were the opinions regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons held by the participants before and after the Institute?

2. Were there significant intra-group differences in opinions held about Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons?

3. Were there significant differences in opinions held about Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons between the participants before and after the Institute?

4. Was there a relationship between the relative equalitarian orientation of participants and opinions held by them relative to Negroes and the culturally disadvantaged?

Procedures Used in the Investigation

The Sample. The sample of participants consisted of seventy persons who provided complete, usable data. Of this number, thirty-seven were Negro and thirty-three were white. The number providing usable data varied with the instrument used and time when the instrument was administered.

Instrumentation. Sentence completion instruments were used to gather data about the opinions held by participants regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons. These instruments were administered at the beginning and at the end of the Institute. The sentence completion instruments were administered by giving the respondents the complete listing of incomplete sentences and asking that the sentences be completed with the first idea which the incomplete sentence prompted. Approximately thirty seconds were allowed to complete each sentence. (Appendix C contains a copy of the instrument.) The Sentence Completion Instrument contained fifteen incomplete sentences, nine of which were loaded. (See Appendix D for the loaded incomplete sentences contained in each sentence completion instrument.)

Each response was scored as "positive," "other," or "negative" according to criteria previously established. A "positive" response was one which indicated the respondent felt there was need

for helping action. A response that showed insight and understanding or was empathic in tone was also classified "positive." A "negative" response was one which ridiculed, showed hostility, or represented thinking based on a derogatory stereotype. An "other" response category was used for responses which were ambivalent or neutral or merely descriptive. Omissions were also included in the "other" category. Since scoring was subjective and scorer bias was, therefore, a factor, an effort was made to randomize errors. First, "before" and "after" responses were coded and then co-mingled. Second, one person (who had no knowledge of when or from whom the responses had been obtained) scored all of the responses using the criteria specified above.

Additionally, the Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFIS) was administered to the Institute participants at the start and again at the close of the Institute. The TFIS is a scale designed to assess a person's position relative to family life on the democratic-autocratic continuum. Since it has been found that one's position regarding family life, as measured by the TFIS, exists within the context of an authoritarian-equalitarian personality,[1] the TFIS was used in the present investigation as a measure of a participant's relative equalitarian orientation. The TFIS consists of forty statements, and the respondent indicates the extent of his agreement with each statement on a 1-7 scale. Thus, the total scores can fall between 40 and 280. The lower the score the greater the equalitarian orientation. (A copy of the TFIS is contained in Appendix E.)

---

[1] D. J. Levinson and P.E. Huffman, "Traditional Family Ideology and Its Relation to Personality," Journal of Personality, Vol. 23:251-273, March, 1955.

Analysis. To secure an estimate of opinions held by participant groups before and after the Institute, sentence completion responses of the several groups were categorized and percentage distributions prepared. In making the comparisons indicated by the questions two, three, and four which gave direction to the study, the Wilcoxon T test and the X^2 test were used. The .05 level of confidence was used as the minimum for a significant difference in all comparisons.

Results. At the start of the Institute the range in TFIS scores for the total participant group was from 90 to 207. The "before" median was 137. The mean score per item was 3.41, which was somewhat higher than that of most other groups to whom the scale has been administered.[2] The intra-group differences in regard to equalitarian orientation become apparent by looking at the top 27 per cent (22 participants) of the group based on TFIS scores in relation to the bottom 27 per cent. The range for the top 27 per cent was 149-207, and for the bottom 27 per cent the range was 90-123. At the close of the Institute the TFIS score range for the total participant group was 90-183. The "after" median was 134.5. The "after" mean score per item was 3.36. The range for the top 27 per cent was 151-183, and for the bottom 27 per cent the range was 90-116. When the total group was compared in regard to "before" and "after" scores by means of the Wilcoxon T, it was found that there was not a significant difference at beyond the .01 level of confidence.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 269.

(The computed T converted to a z was .87.) Inspection of the "before" and "after" medians shows that the group as a whole was more equalitarian in orientation at the close of the Institute. An examination of the composition of the top 27 per cent group "before" and "after" the Institute revealed that ten persons out of nineteen were in this category both "before" and "after." Also, for the bottom 27 per cent group, fourteen persons were in this group both "before" and "after." (Summaries of changes in specific scores may be seen in Appendices F, G, and H.)

Table I shows the pattern of responses of the participant group "before" and "after" the Institute to the sentence completion instrument. Also shown in Table I are certain intra-group comparisons and the resulting X^2 values. It should be noted that even though the response patterns are presented in percentages for readability, the X^2 values were computed using the number--not percentage--of "positive," "other," and "negative" responses. From an examination of Table I it can be seen that:

1. There was no significant difference in the total group patterns "before" and "after" on the sentence completion instrument. However, there was a tendency to give fewer "negative" responses and more "other" and "positive" responses.

2. A significant difference was found between Negro and white participants who responded to the Sentence Completion Instrument before the Institute.

3. When the top 27 per cent of the group based on TFIS scores was compared to the bottom 27 per cent, both "before" and "after" the Institute, significant differences occurred. Inspection of the percentage distributions shows that there was a consistent tendency for the bottom 27 per cent group to give fewer "negative" and more "positive" responses.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO SENTENCE COMPLETION INSTRUMENT BEFORE AND AFTER INSTITUTE

Comparison	Percent of Responses			X^2 Value
	Positive	Other	Negative	
Total Participants SC* Before	45	30	25	
Total Participants SC After	47	33	20	3.72
Negro Participants SC Before	45	34	21	
White Participants SC Before	46	26	28	7.56**
Negro Participants SC After	49	33	18	
White Participants SC After	45	33	22	1.65
Negro Participants SC Before	45	34	21	
Negro Participants SC After	49	33	18	1.44
White Participants SC Before	46	26	28	
White Participants SC After	45	33	22	4.40
Top 27% TFIS Participants SC Before	45	29	26	
Bottom 27% TFIS Participants SC Before	57	30	13	10.18**
Top 27% TFIS Participants SC After	39	33	28	
Bottom 27% TFIS Participants SC After	57	30	13	15.72**

* SC refers to Sentence Completion Instrument responses.
** Significant at the .05 level (X^2 value of 5.99 required at the .05 level of confidence, 9.21 is required at the .01 level).

To provide some insight into the actual responses provided to the sentence completion instruments by the participants, there are listed below some of the incomplete sentences and illustrative "positive," "other," and "negative" responses.

To me poor people are "usually eager to want help and improve if given the opportunity." (positive)

"to be helped." (positive)

"lack things to live like me." (other)

"unfortunate." (other)

"lacking in ambition." (negative)

"lazy and indifferent." (negative)

Negroes often do foolish things because "they are frustrated or unknowing of the ways of society." (positive)

"of their different cultural patterns." (positive)

"they don't realize it." (other)

"of unknown reasons." (other)

"they like to show off." (negative)

"they don't assume personal responsibility." (negative)

The mark of a successful Negro is "the same as that of a white person." (positive)

"recognition as an American rather than as a Negro." (positive)

"calmness." (other)

"his behavior." (other)

"humility." (negative)

"a large automobile." (negative)

In my opinion the "war on poverty" is "a very good program." (positive)

"necessary." (positive)

"good, if handled properly." (other)

"half good, half ridiculous." (other)

"a trend toward socialism." (negative

"just a way to spend more government funds." (negative)

Summary and Discussion

Considering the nature and design of the present investigation, it is recognized that any generalizations which might be made are highly tenuous and subject to re-examination. However, it does appear that the following interpretative comments are in order.

First, since no meaningful reliability and validity studies were conducted with the sentence completion instruments, the inter- and intra-group differences found may well be a function of the lack of instrument reliability and/or validity rather than real differences of opinion regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons. Also, inadequate instrumentation plus scorer bias may account for the relative distributions of "positive," "negative," and "other" responses.

Second, it is recognized that often there are discrepancies between verbalized responses relative to a phenomenon and actual behavior--particularly within reasonably well-educated groups. Certainly by the time the "after" Institute data were collected the participants were well aware of what constituted "acceptable" opinions. This could be a significant factor in the changes observed.

Third, due to the design of the investigation, no definitive cause and effect relationships between Institute activities and changes in orientation and opinions can be claimed. All that can be suggested is that there were some occasions when the two phenomena varied together.

Fourth, keeping in mind the limitations identified, it is noted for the samples studied that:

1. The total participant group was relatively more equalitarian in orientation following Institute participation. However, compared to other groups of similar socio-economic status they were still somewhat authoritarian in orientation.

2. The participant group as a whole was less negative in regard to their opinions of Negroes and culturally deprived persons at the close of the Institute than at the beginning. However, there was still a significant expression of negative opinions. (Examination of the actual responses suggests the hypothesis that the negativism may be in part a function of the persisting paternalistic attitude of the immediate culture.)

3. At the start of the Institute Negro participants as a group tended to be more positive in their opinions regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons than their white counterparts. At the close of the Institute the patterns were similar. (Since the "before" difference was to be expected, some evidence for instrument validity is suggested.)

4. Participants who were more equalitarian in orientation tended to be more positive and less negative in opinions relative to Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons than participants who were less equalitarian in orientation. (This suggests that opinions regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons exist within the context of an authoritarian-equalitarian personality.)

5. The sentence completion instruments consistently evoked more "positive" and "negative" responses and few "other" responses. (It is suggested that the sentence completion technique is more useful in this type of opinion assessment than the word association technique.)

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTE FOR STAFF MEMBERS IN MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOLS
January 31 - April 16, 1966

THEME: THE CHALLENGE OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY

First Week Schedule

January 31, Monday

8:15 - 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 9:45	Introductory Remarks Dr. Archie Dykes, Program Director Dr. Sam Johnson, Dean School of Education Memphis State University Dr. E. C. Merrill, Dean College of Education University of Tennessee Mr. George Barnes, Superintendent Shelby County Schools Dr. E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent Memphis City Schools
9:45 - 10:30	Opinion Assessment Procedures Dr. Harry F. Hodge, Assistant Professor UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education
10:30 - 11:30	"Anthropological Backgrounds of Human Relations" Dr. Ina C. Brown, Professor Social Anthropology, Scarritt College
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:00	"Basic Factors in Personality Development" Dr. Ohmer Milton, Coordinator Learning Resources Center University of Tennessee
2:00 - 2:20	BREAK
2:20 - 3:00	Small Group Meetings General orientation provided by discussion leaders; participants formulate questions for Dr. Milton and Dr. Brown.
3:00 - 4:00	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Milton and Dr. Brown

February 1, Tuesday

8:30 - 9:40	"Science, Technology, and Social Change" Dr. Jack Robertson, Director Division of Business and Economics West Virginia Institute of Technology
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Robertson)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Robertson
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 1:40	Film: "Face of the South"
1:40 - 2:00	BREAK
2:00 - 4:00	Small Group Meetings (Institute participants will have opportunity to discuss ideas and problems suggested by the lecture and film with discussion group leaders)

February 2, Wednesday

8:30 - 9:40	"Culture and Acculturation" Dr. Robertson
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Robertson)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Robertson
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:10	"Race Rationalization in the White Community" Dr. Robertson
2:10 - 2:30	BREAK
2:30 - 3:00	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Robertson)
3:00 - 4:00	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Robertson

February 3, Thursday

8:30 - 9:40	"The Anatomy of Prejudice" Dr. Robertson
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Robertson)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Robertson
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:40	Panel Discussion Dr. Robertson, Moderator Dr. Harry F. Hodge, Assistant Professor UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study Dr. Sam H. Johnson, Dean School of Education Memphis State University Dr. Robert E. Davis, Assistant Professor School of Education Memphis State University Mrs. Rosestelle Woolner, Assistant Professor School of Education Memphis State University
2:40 - 3:00	BREAK
3:00 - 4:00	Small Group Meetings (Discussion of Dr. Robertson's presentations and ideas suggested by panel)

February 4, Friday

8:30 - 9:40	"The Challenge to Teachers in Multi-Cultural Schools" Miss Gertrude Noar, Education Director Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Miss Noar)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Miss Noar
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:30	Films: "The High Wall" and "Walk in My Shoes"
2:30 - 2:50	BREAK
2:50 - 4:00	Small Group Meetings (Discussion of Miss Noar's presentation and ideas suggested by films)

February 5, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"Poverty in Memphis and Shelby County" Dr. Donald D. Stewart Professor of Sociology Memphis State University
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Stewart)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Stewart
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:00	Film: "The Other Face of Dixie"
2:00 - 2:20	BREAK
2:20 - 3:00	Summary and Concluding Statement Dr. Harry F. Hodge

Second Week Schedule

February 7, Monday

8:30 - 9:40	"The Aims of Education in the Multi-Cultural School" Dr. Donald Arnstine, Associate Professor Department of Educational Policy Studies University of Wisconsin
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Arnstine)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Arnstine
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:10	"Classroom Practices and the Aims of Multi-Cultural Schools" Dr. Arnstine
2:10 - 2:30	BREAK
2:30 - 3:00	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Arnstine)
3:00 - 4:00	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Arnstine

bruary 8, Tuesday

8:30 - 9:40	"Moving Toward the Ideal Multi-Cultural School" Dr. Barbara C. Arnstine, Assistant Professor Division of University Extension University of Wisconsin
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Arnstine)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Arnstine
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:40	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Arnstine
2:40 - 3:00	BREAK
3:00 - 4:00	Film: "Incident on Wilson Street"

February 9, Wednesday

8:30 - 9:40	"Teaching and Learning in the Multi-Cultural School" (Part I) Dr. A. Harry Passow, Professor Teachers College Columbia University
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Passow)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Passow
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:00	"Teaching and Learning in the Multi-Cultural School" (Part II) Dr. Passow
2:00 - 2:20	BREAK
2:20 - 3:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Passow

February 12, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"The Nashville Education Improvement Project" Dr. N. A. Crippens, Director
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Crippens)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Crippens
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:00	Film: "Superfluous People"
2:00 - 2:20	BREAK
2:20 - 3:00	Questions and answers, explanation of schedule for follow-up sessions, and concluding statements.

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM FOR SATURDAY SESSIONS

February 19 - April 16

February 19, Saturday

8:30 - 9:30	"The LeMoyne College Project" (Emphasis on speech patterns of the culturally deprived and the implications for teachers in multi-cultural schools) Dr. Juanita Williamson, Professor Department of English LeMoyne College
9:30 - 9:50	BREAK
9:50 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Williamson)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and answer period with Dr. Williamson
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:30	"The Pre-School Disadvantaged Child" Marshall Perritt Coordinator for Federal Projects Shelby County Board of Education
1:30 - 1:50	BREAK
1:50 - 2:30	Film: "Children Without"

February 26, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"How One Integrated Junior High School Revamped Curriculum and Instruction for Disadvantaged and Gifted Students" Dr. Fred Venditti, Assistant Professor Department of Educational Administration and Supervision University of Tennessee
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 11:30	Large Group Discussion of Dr. Venditti's Presentation
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:30	"A Positive Approach to School Discipline" Dr. Venditti (Lecture and large group discussion)
1:30 - 1:50	BREAK
1:50 - 2:30	Film: "A Chance at the Beginning"

March 5, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"Life in a Multi-Cultural School" Dr. Aeolian Lockert, Assistant Principal Cameron High School Nashville, Tennessee
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 11:00	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Lockert
11:00 - 11:30	Film: "A Morning for Jimmy"
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:15	"The Pine Hill Experience" Mr. Gene Olds, Principal Pine Hill Elementary School Memphis, Tennessee
1:15 - 1:30	BREAK
1:30 - 2:15	Question and Answer Period with Mr. Olds and Dr. Lockert

March 12, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"Speech - A Neglected Basic Skill" Mr. Theodore Soistmann, Doctoral Student Department of Educational Administration and Supervision University of Tennessee
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Mr. Soistmann)
10:30 - 11:30	Large Group Discussion of Mr. Soistmann's presentation
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:30	"Reading Instruction in the Multi-Cultural School" Mr. Soistmann
1:30 - 1:50	BREAK
1:50 - 2:30	Large Group Reaction to Mr. Soistmann's presentation

n 19, Saturday

8:30 - 9:30	"Materials and Approaches for Improving Reading Skills in a Multi-Cultural School" Dr. Lucille B. Taylor, Associate Professor Department of Curriculum and Instruction Memphis State University
9:30 - 9:50	BREAK
9:50 - 10:30	Small Group Meeting (Discussion and formulation of questions for Dr. Taylor)
10:30 - 11:30	Question and answer period with Dr. Taylor
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:30	"Diagnosis of Reading Problems" (Emphasis on utilization and interpretation of appropriate tests) Dr. Rita Sawyer, Associate Professor Department of Curriculum and Instruction Memphis State University
1:30 - 1:50	BREAK
1:50 - 2:30	Question and answer session with Dr. Sawyer

March 26, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"Remedial Approaches to Specific Reading Disabilities" Mr. Soistmann
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Mr. Soistmann)
10:30 - 11:30	Large Group Discussion of Mr. Soistmann's presentation
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:15	"A Look at Other Language Arts in a Multi-Cultural School" Mr. Soistmann
1:15 - 1:30	BREAK
1:30 - 2:00	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Mr. Soistmann)
2:00 - 2:30	Large Group Discussion

April 2, Saturday

8:30 - 9:30	"New Approaches and Methodologies" Mr. Soistmann
9:30 - 9:50	BREAK
9:50 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Mr. Soistmann)
10:30 - 11:30	Large Group Discussion of Mr. Soistmann's presentation
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:30	"A Linguistic Approach in One Classroom" Mrs. Theodore Soistmann, Teacher Knox County Schools Knoxville, Tennessee
1:30 - 1:45	BREAK
1:45 - 2:15	Question and answer period with Mrs. Soistmann
2:15 - 2:45	Film: "All the Way Home"

April 16, Saturday

8:30 - 9:30	"Opinion Assessment Procedures" Dr. Harry F. Hodge, Assistant Professor UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education
9:30 - 9:50	BREAK
9:50 - 11:30	"Implications of the Institute for Educational Programs and Practices" Panel of Institute Participants with contributions from floor
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:30	Film: "A Question of Chairs: The Challenge to American Education"
1:30 - 1:45	BREAK
1:45 - 2:30	Concluding Session

APPENDIX C

1. Some of my friends smoke cigarettes. p. 2

2. We are going. p. 2

3. Some people live near the sea. p. 2

4. Elizabeth's brother is studying to become a doctor. p. 2

5. People were very kind to us. p. 3

6. A friend of mine bought this picture. p. 3

7. Virginia does not like to drive in heavy traffic. p. 3

8. Do you like it? p. 3

9. People die of many diseases. p. 4

10. This machine is broken. p. 4

11. In my opinion, American food is not very good. p. 4

12. This book belongs to Virginia. p. 4

13. Some people do not get enough exercise. p. 5

14. In my opinion, this book is very important. p. 5

15. This person was a good teacher when I was young. p. 5

APPENDIX D

LOADED ITEMS CONTAINED IN SENTENCE COMPLETION INSTRUMENT

To me poor people are

Children should be allowed to attend school who

People who work with their hands are

Negroes often do foolish things because

People who do not have a lot

The mark of a successful Negro is

The trouble with Negroes is

Some people do not get ahead because

In my opinion the "war on poverty" is

To me Negroes are

Some people do not get ahead because

The trouble with Negroes is

Poor people should

Negro children often dislike school because

People who do not have a lot deserve

The main reason some people are poor is

Poor children often dislike school because

APPENDIX E

TRADITIONAL FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALE

We hope that you will find the following survey interesting. Please read each statement carefully and mark it according to your first reaction. Give your personal point of view. Don't talk the statements over with anyone until you have finished. There are no right or wrong responses. Do not omit any statements.

Write one number from the following scale opposite each statement to indicate your reaction to it:

7--strongly agree	3--slightly disagree
6--agree	2--disagree
5--slightly agree	1--strongly disagree

___ 1. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.

___ 2. It's a pretty feeble sort of man who can't get ahead in the world.

___ 3. A teen-ager should be allowed to decide most things for himself.

___ 4. A marriage should not be made unless the couple plans to have children.

___ 5. A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things.

___ 6. It is a reflection on a husband's manhood if his wife works.

___ 7. Whatever some educators may say, "Spare the rod and spoil the child" still holds, even in these modern times.

___ 8. Women have as much right as men to sow wild oats.

___ 9. Women think less clearly than men and are more emotional.

___ 10. Faithlessness is the worst fault a husband could have.

___ 11. It isn't healthy for a child to like to be alone, and he should be discouraged from playing by himself.

___ 12. Petting is something a nice girl wouldn't want to do.

___ 13. Even today women live under unfair restrictions that ought to be done away with.

___ 14. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.

___ 15. It helps the child in the long run if he is made to conform to his parents' ideas.

___16. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it.

___17. Women can be too bright for their own good.

___18. The most important qualities of a real man are strength of will and determined ambition.

___19. In making family decisions, parents ought to take the opinions of children into account.

___20. One of the worst problems in our society is "free love," because it mars the true value of sex relations.

___21. Women who want to remove the word "obey" from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife.

___22. It doesn't seem quite right for a man to be a visionary; dreaming should be left to women.

___23. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something.

___24. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.

___25. It is a woman's job more than a man's to uphold our moral code, especially in sexual matters.

___26. A man who doesn't provide well for his family ought to consider himself pretty much a failure as husband and father.

___27. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.

___28. There is a lot of evidence such as the Kinsey Report which shows we have to crack down harder on young people to save our moral standards.

___29. Women should take an active interest in politics and community problems as well as in their families.

___30. In choosing a husband, a woman will do well to put ambition at the top of her list of desirable qualities.

___31. The saying "Mother knows best" still has more than a grain of truth.

___32. A man can scarcely maintain respect for his fiancee if they have sexual relations before they are married.

___33. The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father.

4. It goes against nature to place women in positions of authority over men.

5. It is important to teach the child as early as possible the manners and morals of his society.

6. A lot of the sex problems of married couples arise because their parents have been too strict with them about sex.

7. The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained.

8. A woman whose children are messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.

9. A child who is unusual in any way should be encouraged to be more like other children.

0. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF TOTAL RESPONSES ON TFIS
BY PARTICIPANTS "BEFORE", "AFTER", DIFFERENCE

Participant Number	"Before"	"After"	Difference	Participant Number	"Before"	"After"	Difference
3285	207	175	-32	1243	137	147	+10
3283	205	183	-22	2263	137	145	+ 8
2257	175	145	-30	4302	136	109	-27
3281	172	183	+11	1240	136	148	+12
3279	171	156	-15	4301	135	148	+13
3284	168	140	-28	4295	134	158	+24
2259	166	159	- 7	5311	133	130	- 3
4290	166	172	+ 6	5318	130	151	+21
1253	162	156	- 6	3273	129	122	- 7
2270	159	166	+ 7	2262	128	97	-31
1249	157	149	- 8	5316	127	112	-15
1250	156	143	-13	3274	127	128	+ 1
2269	154	182	+28	2265	127	123	- 4
3285	154	165	+11	2258	124	112	-12
4282	153	145	- 8	3284	124	132	+ 8
1251	152	118	-34	3272	124	102	-22
2267	149	134	-15	2268	123	116	- 7
4283	146	136	-10	5313	122	135	+13
3286	146	148	+ 2	2271	122	111	-11
2272	145	167	+22	5307	121	107	-14
3289	145	155	+10	1242	117	120	+ 3
4287	145	157	+12	5304	115	111	- 4
4284	143	148	+ 5	2256	114	115	+ 1
4288	142	134	- 8	5317	113	104	- 9
4285	143	130	-13	1246	112	110	- 2
2266	141	167	+26	5310	110	115	+ 5
3287	141	143	+ 3	4297	110	118	+ 8
4289	139	124	-15	3280	110	119	+ 9
4292	138	152	+14	4293	110	102	- 8
4291	138	137	- 1	1248	102	90	-12
2241	138	162	+24	5308	100	122	+22
4286	138	123	-15	1241	99	99	0
4293	138	144	+ 6	5314	99	95	- 4
4294	138	152	+14	1254	91	95	+ 4
3288	137	128	- 9	5315	90	95	+ 5

"Before" Range 90-207
"Before" Median 137
"Before" Mean Score per item 3.41

"After" Range 90-183
"After" Median 134.5
"After" Mean Score per item 3.36

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF TOP 27% AND BOTTOM 27% OF PARTICIPANTS
RESPONSES TO TFI SCALE, "BEFORE", "AFTER"

TOP 27% "BEFORE"

Participant Number	Score
3285	207
3283	205
1255*	189
2257	175
3287	172
3275	171
4303*	170
4291	168
2267	166
4290	166
4288*	163
1253	162
2270	159
1249	157
1250	156
5312*	154
2269	154
4296	154
4289	153
4294*	153
5305	152
1251	149

*Did not take "after" test
N=22
Range 149-207

TOP 27% "AFTER"

Participant Number	Score
3287#	183
3283#	183
2269#	182
3285#	175
4290#	172
2264	167
3276	167
2270#	166
4296#	165
1244	162
2267#	159
4295	158
4292	157
3275#	156
1253#	156
3281	155
5309	152
3286	152
5318	151

#Also in top 27% of "before" test
N=19
Range 151-183

BOTTOM 27% "BEFORE"

Participant Number	Score
2261*	123
2268	123
3278*	122
5313	122
2271	122
5307	121
1424	117
5304	115
2256	114
5317	113
1246	112
5310	110
4297	110
3280	110
4293	110
2272*	109
1248	102
5308	100
1241	99
5314	99
1254	91
5306	90

* Did not take "after" test
N=22
Range 90-123

BOTTOM 27% "AFTER"

Participant Number	Score
2268#	116
2256#	115
5310#	115
5316	112
2258	112
5304#	111
2271#	111
1246#	110
4302	109
5307#	107
5317#	104
4293#	102
3272	102
1241#	99
2262	97
5314#	95
1254#	95
5306#	95
1248#	90

#Also in bottom 27% of "before" test
N=19
Range 90-116

APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF NEGRO PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES "BEFORE"-"AFTER" to TFI SCALE

Participant Number	"Before"	"After"	Difference
3285	207	175	-32
3287	172	183	+11
4291	168	140	-28
1253	162	156	- 6
2270	159	166	+ 7
4296	154	165	+11
4289	153	145	- 8
5305	152	118	-34
1251	149	134	-15
2266	146	148	+ 2
3281	145	155	+10
2260	143	148	+ 5
3279	143	134	- 9
1252	143	130	-13
3276	141	167	+26
1245	139	124	-15
4298	138	137	- 1
2259	138	123	-15
4299	138	144	+ 6
3286	138	152	+14
4302	136	109	-27
1240	136	148	+12
4295	134	158	+24
5311	133	130	- 3
3273	129	122	- 7
2262	128	97	-31
2258	124	112	-12
3272	124	102	-22
2268	123	116	- 7
5313	122	135	+13
5304	115	111	- 4
2256	114	115	+ 1
1246	112	110	- 2
5310	110	115	+ 5
4297	110	118	+ 8
1241	99	99	0
5306	90	95	+ 5

"Before" Range 90-207 N=37 "After" Range 95-183

Negroes N=37

20 scored lower on "After" test (54%)
16 scored higher on "After" test (43%)
1 score remained same (3%)

Whites N=33

16 scored lower on "After" test (49%)
17 scored higher on "After" test (51%)